



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,121	03/16/2001	Laurence H. Langholz	ALL865/01028	3311

24118 7590 07/11/2003

HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN  
228 W 17TH PLACE  
TULSA, OK 74119

EXAMINER

TRAN A, PHI DIEU N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3637

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/812,121

Applicant(s)

LANGHOLZ ET AL.

Examiner

Phi D A

Art Unit

3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson ( 2922501) in view of Miller et al (4899500) and Fergusson (5244346).

Wilson (figure 1) shows a mobile communication tower having a trailer having a chassis ( 28) mounted on two or more wheels ( 10), a hitch ( 12), a plurality of chassis guy wire ( 54, 56) attaching points and a plurality of leveling mechanisms ( 26) wherein the chassis having a plurality of pivotally mounted outriggers (48) providing support and stabilization to the structure, each outrigger having an outrigger guy wire attaching point (figure 2) and a foot, the lower end of each guy wire is attached to an outrigger guy wire attaching point, a telescopic tower ( 30, 31) pivotally mounted on the trailer, a mechanism ( 36) to raise and lower the tower, a plurality of tower guy wire attaching points on the tower, a plurality of guy wires each with an upper end attached to one of the tower guy wire attaching points and a lower end attached to one of the chassis guy wire attaching points.

Wilson does not show a plurality of outriggers pivotally mounted to the chassis, each of the outriggers mounted to the chassis having an outrigger guys wire attaching point and a foot, the lower end of each guy wire being attached to an outrigger guys wire attaching point, the foot being vertically adjustable.

Miller et al shows foot ( 8) being vertically adjustable to allow for compensate with different ground levels.

Fergusson (figure 3) shows a plurality of outriggers (86) mounted to the chassis to provide for support and stabilization for structure.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson to show a plurality of outriggers pivotally mounted to the chassis, each of the outriggers mounted to the chassis having an outrigger guys wire attaching point and a foot, the lower end of each guy wire being attached to an outrigger guys wire attaching point, the foot being vertically adjustable as taught by Miller because having a plurality of outriggers pivotally mounted to the chassis would provide support and stability to the chassis when the mast is raised as taught by Wilson and Fergusson together, having the lower end of each guys wire being attached to an outrigger guy wire attaching point on the pivotally mounted chassis outriggers would further enhance the stability of the mast to the chassis, and having the foot being of the pivotally mounted chassis outriggers being adjustable would allow for compensation of the different height of the supporting floor levels of the supporting structure.

3. Claims 3, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (2922501) in view of Fergusson (5244346).

Wilson shows a method of stabilizing a mobile communication tower having the steps of leveling a trailer having a chassis (28) mounted on two or more wheels ( 10), a hitch (12) a plurality of chassis guy wire attaching points, moving the tower pivotally mounted to a chassis on the trailer from a horizontal ( dotted figure) to a vertical position ( solid figure ), moving a plurality of pivotally mounted outriggers ( 48) from a retracted to an extended position to

Art Unit: 3637

provide support and stabilization to the structure, attaching upper ends of a plurality of guy wires to the erected tower, attaching the lower ends of the guy wires to the chassis of the trailer and tightening the plurality of guy wires.

Wilson does not show the steps of moving a plurality of outriggers pivotally mounted to the chassis from a retracted to an extended position, attaching the lower ends of the guy wires to the pivotally mounted chassis outriggers of the trailer and the upper ends of the wires to the tower, and tightening the plurality of guy wires.

Fergusson (figure 3) shows a plurality of extendable and retractable outriggers (86) mounted to the chassis to provide for support and stabilization for the structure.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson to show a plurality of outriggers pivotally mounted to the chassis being moved from a retracted to an extended position, attaching the lower ends of the guy wires to the pivotally mounted chassis outriggers of the trailer and the upper ends of the wires to the tower, and tightening the plurality of guy wires because having a plurality of outriggers pivotally mounted to the chassis would provide support and stability to the chassis when the mast is raised as taught by Wilson and Fergusson together, having the lower end of each guys wire being attached to an outrigger guy wire attaching point on the pivotally mounted chassis outriggers with the upper ends to the mast would further enhance the stability of the mast to the chassis.

Wilson as modified by Fergusson shows all the claimed limitations. The claimed method steps of stabilizing a tower would have been the obvious method steps of stabilizing Wilson's modified structures.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 4, 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art shows different tower structures.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phi D A whose telephone number is 703-306-9136. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

Art Unit: 3637

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 703-308-2486. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Phi Dieu Tran A  
July 8, 2003

PA

LANNA MAI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

*Lanna Mai*